



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,906	10/10/2000	Hrushikesh Dingari	00-5013	4626

32127 7590 11/12/2003

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSON
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3HO1
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

TRAN, LAMBERT L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

3

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,906

Applicant(s)

DINGARI ET AL.

Examiner

Lambert L. Tran

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the application filed on 10 October 2000.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's claim for priority based upon Provisional Application No. 60/219,195 filed on 19 July 2000.
3. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 19 July 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Devine et al., U.S. Patent No 6,385,644, hereinafter referred to as Devine.

6. In regard to claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 19, 24, Devine disclosed:

contacting a network address of the server (transmitting and receiving, enable an interactive web-based communications) [see Devine, col. 2, lines 37-41, and lines 52-57];
a server presenting a user at a client end with a page (browser web page) offering parameters for formulating a report and scheduling the running and delivery of the report [see Devine, col. 2, lines 28-31, col. 4, lines 36-40, col. 6, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 35-38];
the user selecting parameters upon which the report is to be formulated and scheduled [see Devine, col. 14, lines 33-35]; and
the server interfacing with the database to retrieve information designated by the selected parameters and generating the report in accordance with the selected parameters [see Devine, col. 14, lines 43-65].

7. In regard to claims 2, 7, 12, 17, 20, 25, Devine disclosed:

parameters include a parameter indicating whether the report is to be run immediately, at a specified time, or periodically (an indication of the scheduling for the report) [see Devine, col. 14, lines 33-35, col. 16, lines 1-14].

8. In regard to claims 3, 8, 13, 21, Devine disclosed:

the step of the server transmitting a completed report to a display device for display to the user (available to be displayed at the client terminals) [see Devine, 19, lines 7-11].

9. In regard to claims 4, 9, 14, 22, Devine disclosed:

Art Unit: 2142

the step of the server storing a completed report in a memory (repository) [see Devine, col. 12, lines 50-56].

10. In regard to claims 5, 10, 15, 18, 23, 26, Devine disclosed:

the database stores information relating to multiple catalogues and the report may include information relating to more than one catalogue (databases, set of report data) [see Devine, col. 13, lines 16-25, col. 16, lines 56-57].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lagarde et al., U.S. Patent No 5,745,754, hereinafter referred to as Lagarde, in view of Barry et al., U.S. Patent No 6,615,258, hereinafter referred to as Barry.

13. In regard to claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 19, 24, Lagarde disclosed:

*contacting a network address of the server (create page) [see Lagarde, col. 7, lines 35-35];
a server presenting a user at a client end with a page offering parameters for formulating a report and scheduling the running and delivery of the report (processing agent uses specifying parameters) [see Lagarde, col. 7, lines 2-8, col. 6, lines 23-30];
the user selecting parameters upon which the report is to be formulated and scheduled [see Lagarde, col. 5, lines 46-53]; and*

Art Unit: 2142

the server interfacing with the database to retrieve information designated by the selected parameters and generating the report in accordance with the selected parameters [see Lagarde, col. 5, lines 14-22, col. 5, lines 46-53].

14. In regard to claims 2, 7, 12, 17, 20, 25, Lagarde disclosed the invention substantially as claimed. However, Lagarde did not expressly disclose:

parameters include a parameter indicating whether the report is to be run immediately, at a specified time, or periodically.

15. In the same field of web-based data management report, Barry disclosed:

parameters include a parameter indicating whether the report is to be run immediately, at a specified time, or periodically [see Barry, col. 27, lines 9-11]. An ordinary artisan in the art at the same time the invention was made, would have been motivated to look to a way to provide more capabilities to requests and handling of these requests without needless user intervention [see Lagarde, col. 5, lines 1-9], because this would directly increase the usability of the system.

16. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the software programming art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Lagarde teachings dealing with report generation with the automated report generation teachings of Barry, for the purpose of providing a system that is more flexible, further utilizing the Web paradigm to allow easy and convenient access to all of the services from the user's perspective [see Barry, col. 3, lines 39-41].

17. For the rationale set forth above, claims 2, 7, 12, 17, 20, 25 are rejected.

18. In regard to claims 3, 8, 13, 21, Lagarde disclosed:

Art Unit: 2142

the step of the server transmitting a completed report to a display device for display to the user
(view the report results) [see Lagarde, 5, lines 46-48, col. 7, lines 6-7].

19. In regard to claims 4, 9, 14, 22, Lagarde disclosed:

the step of the server storing a completed report (the results that are generated) in a memory
(stored in a file) [see Lagarde, col. 7, lines 62-65].

20. In regard to claims 5, 10, 15, 18, 23, 26, Lagarde disclosed:

the database stores information relating to multiple catalogues and the report may include
information relating to more than one catalogue (multiple databases of different types) [see
Lagarde, col. 5, lines 61-62].

21. Since all the claims limitations are taught by the combination inventions of Lagarde and
Barry, claims 1-26 are rejected.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's
disclosure.

- a. Selvarajan et al., U.S. Patent 6,279,033, disclosed system and method for
asynchronous control of report generation using network interface.
- b. Yost et al., U.S. Patent 6,154,766, disclosed system and method for automatic
transmission of personalized OLAP report output.
- c. Mahoney et al., U.S. Patent 5,819,271, disclosed corporate information
communication and delivery system and method.

Art Unit: 2142

- d. Brandt et al., U.S. Patent 6,377,993, disclosed integrated proxy interface for web-based data management reports.
- e. Begley et al., U.S. Patent 6,360,246, disclosed report generation architecture for remotely generated data.
- f. Thinqe Corporation, (www.thinqe.com) sale brochure title: "Merchandising Sale Portfolio", published August, 2000.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lambert L. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4663.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F at 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

L.L.T
Assistant Examiner
GAU 2142
November 6, 2003

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marc Thompson
Primary Examiner
(703) 308-6750